



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,033	10/26/2006	Philippe Bonny	203.802	3269
37004	7590	08/01/2008	EXAMINER	
POWER DEL VALLE LLP			MISA, JOAN D	
233 WEST 72 STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10023			3671	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/599,033	Applicant(s) BONNY ET AL.
	Examiner JOAN D. MISA	Art Unit 3671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1668)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

Examiner acknowledges applicant's revision to the Declaration to correct the filing date of the foreign priority

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonny et al. (WO 02/091,863 A1) in view of Parker et al. (4,761,943) and Dabrigeon (FR 2,390,084).

Regarding claim 1, Bonny et al. teaches a leaf stripper comprised of a frame (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, 1) having a circular housing (5 and 11) inside which a blade turbine (8) and a blade (6) are mounted rotating on a shaft (7) which is connected to a motor (10), characterized by an apertured plate (2) with openings (3) mounted on the upper part of the frame and with a straight rods which form a grill (4), a sleeve (13) with an exit opening (opening on 13), mounted on the side of the frame.

Bonny et al. does not expressly disclose a suction device mounted on the sleeve. However, Parker et al. discloses a mower, which further includes a suction device (Fig. 1, vacuum-blower unit 75) mounted on the sleeve mounted on the side of the cutting device. The suction device as taught by Parker et al. allows the clippings to be collected and sent to a bag (bags installed in cart 90) to collect the clippings.

Bonny et al. and Parker et al. are analogous art in that both are from the field of endeavor of harvesters and in particular, both are cutting devices that produce debris that needs to be disposed of. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the leaf stripper of Bonny et al. to include the suction device with the bag taught by Parker et al. in order to improve the transportation of the stripped leaves from the housing and to provide a temporary storage for collecting the debris or leaves.

Furthermore, the combination of Bonny et al. and Parker et al. does not disclose the rods extending beyond the apertured plate. Dabrigeon teaches that it is old and well known in the leaf stripping art to provide rods (fig.1, 17 or fig.2, 18) that extend beyond the apertured plate equivalent (slender surface of casing 9 closest to guard 17 in fig.1 or 18 in fig.2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the rods of the leaf stripper of the combination above beyond the apertured plate as taught by Dabrigeon since such is old and well known in the leaf stripping art.

Regarding claim 3, Bonny et al. further teaches an apertured plate (Fig. 2, 2) that has parallel openings (parallel openings 3 accomplished by the parallel positioning of bars 4).

Regarding claim 4, the examiner views the long narrow opening as grooves and the rods can be considered to be ribs. Bonny et al. teaches an apertured plate (Fig. 2, 2) that has guiding grooves (3) and ribs (4).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOAN D. MISA whose telephone number is (571)270-3745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Will can be reached on (571) 272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thomas B Will/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3671

JDM 7/29/08